

**Draft Summary of the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
November 20, 2003**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted a meeting for the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group (RSWG) on November 20, 2003 via conference call.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary:

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the RSWG meeting. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations and the desired outcomes of the meeting were discussed. The meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively.

Action Items – October 31, 2003 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting

A summary of the October 31, 2003 RSWG meeting is posted on the relicensing web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Action Item #R86: | Check potential wildlife corridor issue from the Department of Fish and Game (<i>carry-over action item</i>). |
| Status: | Doug Rischbieter (DWR) coordinated with Andy Atkinson (CDFG) on the placement of proposed recreational facilities within wildlife corridors associated with the Oroville Wildlife Area (OWA). Andy stated that the entire OWA is considered a wildlife corridor and recreation uses must be compatible with wildlife values. The Environmental Work Group is studying restoration and preservation needs in the OWA. The connection of the OWA to the foothills is also an issue of concern. |
| Action Item #R90: | Check the status of socioeconomics-related action items and add to the "Settlement Issues" list. |
| Status: | The socioeconomics-related action items were inadvertently left off of previous versions of the separate resource action lists but have been added to the Settlement Issues list. |
| Action Item #R91: | Resolve outstanding trails issues. Review trails resource action and submit comments in writing for distribution to the Work Group by November Work Group meeting. JPA and DWR will coordinate on priority tallies on trails items |
| Status: | A consolidated resource action for trails-related proposals has been developed by The Dangermond Group (JPA) on behalf of the trail users group; however there are still several unresolved issues. The trail users group feels that these issues should be studied further in the development of the Recreation Plan for the project and in the general plan process being led by the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). There were concerns expressed that all of the trails-related proposals are being lumped into one resource action when there are conflicts among the stakeholders; separate resource actions can still be submitted. |

- Action Item #R92:** Send written comments to Doug Rischbieter (DWR) regarding content of lists and justification for why a resource action should be moved, and re-distribute lists to the RSWG.
- Status:** DWR received no written comments by the due date of November 7, 2003. Some comments were received late and DWR is expecting more. Since the November Plenary Group meeting was cancelled, the comment period was extended through the week of Thanksgiving. All comments will eventually receive responses from DWR. The Work Group was asked to refer to the justification code used in earlier versions of the resource action matrix to understand why a particular resource action was assigned to a list. The goal is to re-submit the revised resource action lists in advance of their finalization and presentation to the Plenary Group in December 2003.
- Action Item #R93:** Review the resource action matrix and help fill-out forms for “important” resource actions.
- Status:** The completion of resource action identification forms is an ongoing effort. There has been significant effort in identifying resource action proponents, which can serve as a contact point for acquiring information in the future. The minimum information required for a resource action identification form is a brief description of the proposal and a point of contact.
- Action Item #R94:** Present resource action list to the Plenary Group and the PDEA team for analysis.
- Status:** The presentation of resource actions from the RSWG has been rescheduled to the next Plenary Group meeting scheduled for December 16, 2003.

Preview Presentation to Plenary Group and PDEA Team

Because no presentation was made to the Plenary Group in November, the discussion focused on the upcoming presentation scheduled for December 16, 2003. DWR will accept comments on the resource action lists over the next several weeks, all of which will be reviewed and considered in revising and finalizing the resource action lists, which will be at the discretion of DWR. All revisions will be tracked. The finalized lists will be e-mailed to the RSWG a couple of weeks in advance of the Plenary Group meeting in December. It was requested that Doug Rischbieter represent the RSWG and make the presentation to the Plenary Group.

Other

Representatives from Butte County inquired whether a master resource action tracking system has been developed for the project. This database, which will be a searchable MS Access database, is in the process of being developed, but no anticipated date of completion has been provided. The Facilitator agreed to follow-up on this issue.

A question was raised regarding why acquisition items were not on the “A” list. It was explained that it would not be appropriate to analyze proposals on lands that DWR does not currently own. The environmental analysis needs to focus on the proposed project, not on the land acquisition itself. Some participants continue to feel that these items should go on the “A” list. It was noted that regardless of what list a resource action is on, it will not get dropped from the process and will receive some level of analysis. It was also noted that the spring 2004 PDEA would likely include analysis of fewer resource actions than the Final PDEA, which will be based on resource actions that have refined through the settlement process. Participants indicated that they would like these proposed future steps documented in writing through a revised process diagram. The Facilitator indicated that a revised process diagram has been requested by various stakeholders, but has not been developed yet; she will follow-up on this issue.

It was noted that there would likely be no study reports discussed at the next RSWG meeting; however, there may be reports available for distribution at the meeting. It is estimated that the

recreation needs analysis (R17) would be available for internal review in February 2004 and available to the RSWG in April 2004.

Next Steps

The RSWG agreed on the following meeting date/time:

Date: Thursday, December 18, 2003
Time: 6:00 to 10:00 PM
Location: Oroville

Action Items

The following list of action items identified by the RSWG includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item status.

Action Item #R95: Send comments on resource action lists to DWR, finalize resource action lists and distribute to RSWG, and present lists to the Plenary Group. All comments submitted to DWR will receive written responses.

Responsible: Work Group / DWR

Due Date: November 26, 2003 (comments due) / December 4 (resource action lists distributed to WG) / December 16, 2003 (Plenary Group presentation)

Action Item #R96: Follow-up with DWR on resource action tracking system.

Responsible: Facilitator

Due Date: December 18, 2003

Action Item #R97: Follow-up on the availability of a revised process diagram.

Responsible: Facilitator

Due Date: December 18, 2003